REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of the above-identified application is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

Claim 6 is canceled and Claims 19-33 are newly added by way of this amendment. Thus, Claims 1-5 and 7-33 are pending in this application, with Claims 1, 13, 14, 17-19, 24 and 29 being independent.

Claims 1, 14, 17 and 18 are amended to include the subject matter previously included in Claim 6.

The Official Action rejects Claims 1-4, 10, 12-14, 17 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,293,469, hereinafter *Outa*, in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,629,752, hereinafter *Kinjo*; Claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Outa* in view of *Kinjo* and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,469,805, hereinafter *Behlock*; Claims 6-8, 11 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Outa* in view of *Kinjo* and further in view of JP 06-195421, hereinafter *Arakawa*; and Claims 9 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Outa* in view of *Kinjo* and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,845,304, hereinafter *Iijima*.

One aspect of the presently claimed invention is generally directed toward detection of information concerning line widths of extracted line graphics, extraction of an enclosed area that is surrounded by the extracted line graphics, and detection of information concerning the color within the extracted enclosed area. This subject matter is generally included in Claims 1, 14 and 17-18 in combination with other claimed features.

To better differentiate over *Outa* and *Kinjo*, Claims 1, 14 and 17-18 are amended to generally include the subject matter previously included in Claim 6. Claims 1, 14 and 17-18 are also amended to more clearly define first and second color information. Thus, Claims 1, 14 and 17-18 now generally define combinations of features directed toward detection by a processor of first information concerning a color within the extracted enclosed area, and detection by the processor of second information concerning a color of the line graphics.

The Official Action rejects Claim 6 (the subject matter now included in Claim 1) based on *Outa* in view of *Kinjo* and further in view of *Arakawa*. However, none of the cited disclosures alone or in combination include detection with a processor of both first information concerning the color of the extracted area, and second information concerning the color of the line graphics.

For example, *Outa* discloses an apparatus for receiving graphic symbols whose sizes are mutually different, and whose positions are irregularly arranged. The apparatus automatically adjusts the symbols to be balanced, so that the positions of the centers of the graphic symbols are aligned. Although *Outa* teaches the technology of converting the graphic image into vectors, *Outa* does not show detection with a processor of a color of an extracted area or color of line graphics.

Kinjo discloses a method of determining an exposure amount using optical recognition of facial features. The image data of the shape of a person's head is generated by binarization or another technique. The contour of the person's head is traced with vectors, but no line graphic is extracted or detected. Further, no color of a line graphic is detected.

With respect to the subject matter of former Claim 6, the Official Action relies on *Arakawa* for a disclosure of a processor that detects information concerning color of a line graphic. However, this characterization is not accurate. *Arakawa* describes in paragraph [0011] that image data created by a graphics computer or image data created by a scanner is raster data, and is difficult to expand or scale. However, if the raster data is changed to vector data, it becomes easy to change the position, amplify, cutback, rotate, and otherwise manipulate the data. *Arakawa* discloses scanning a textile pattern having areas of color. Border-line data is generated based on the edge of the color patterns (paragraph [0010], lines 7-9 and Fig. 5). The border-line data is changed into vector data, so that the pattern can be migrated, amplified, etc. (paragraph [0012], lines 2-3). The border-line data is merely the border of a color area (Fig. 5). Neither the border-line data nor the vectors relate to line graphic data, nor do they have any color characteristics. Further, the border-line data and the vectors are not detected, but rather generated based on the edges of color areas. Therefore, *Arakawa* does not disclose detection of information concerning color of a line graphic in combination with the other claimed features.

For at least the reasons stated above, Claims 1, 14, 17 and 18 are allowable. Also, Claims 2-5, 7-13, 15 and 16 are allowable at least by virtue of their dependence from allowable independent claims, and also because they define features that differentiate over the cited disclosures.

For example, Claim 7 defines a processor storing information concerning a color of a line graph, and relies on *Arakawa* for a disclosure of such. As noted above, *Arakawa* does not detect color information of line graphics, and certainly does not disclose storage of such.

Claims 9 and 16 define combinations of features directed toward comparison of line widths of line graphics with a specified threshold value and generation of vector data according to the comparison results. *Iijima* is relied upon in the Official Action for a disclosure of such. However, it is not understood where or how *Iijima* discloses generation of a vector according to comparison of a line width of a line graphic. As described in column 7, lines 54-57, *Iijima* retrieves document elements possessing the selected line thickness attribute. The data is pre-existing and is not "generated" as defined by the Claims. It is requested that it be explained where or how *Iijima* discloses the above-noted features, or that the rejection be withdrawn.

New Claims 19-33 define combinations of features including generation of a set of data including information on a first color of line graphs, and information on a second color of an enclosed area surrounded by the line graphs. For reasons similar to those stated earlier with respect to Claim 1, Claims 19-33 are allowable in view of the cited disclosures.

For the reasons stated above, it is requested that all the rejections be withdrawn and that this application be allowed in a timely manner.

Should any questions arise in connection with this application, or should the Examiner feel that a teleconference with the undersigned would be helpful in resolving any remaining issues pertaining to this application, the undersigned respectfully request that he be contacted at the number indicated.

Respectfully submitted,

BURNS, DOANE, SWECKER & MATHIS, L.L.P.

Date: March 30, 2005   By: *Kari B. Uhlroff (Rn. 53,297)*
William C. Rowland
Registration No. 30,888

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1404
(703) 836-6620